

**From:** Jeremy Mazner  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/28/02 3:42am  
**Subject:** In support of settlement

To whom it may concern,

As a member of the software development community, and a long time computer user, I write to express my firm support for the proposed settlement expressed in the Nov 6 Revised Proposed Final Judgement.

Any software developer will tell you that their best work is done on the backs of others'. The same holds true in any industry -- we make advances by building on the current generation of technology. It is natural and expected that the baseline for any technology continue to evolve. It was a revolution in the early 1990's for a consumer operating system to include native support for internet protocols like TCP/IP, and that revolution enabled an entire new generation of software to be written. No longer did an application developer have to worry about how their application should communicate with other computers -- the operating system provided that baseline functionality, so that the developer could focus on their real value-add.

Similarly, the inclusion of HTTP and HTML protocols in Windows provides a baseline for developers today, making it possible to build new categories of applications that leverage the world wide web, without having to implement these protocols from scratch every time. As a developer, I rely on a robust, evolving platform that I know will provide the same baseline services on every computer on which my application is installed.

By way of comparison, can you imagine a home electronics company like Sony building products for a world where every house might have a different type of electrical service? 110V at 60Hz here, 220V at 50Hz there, 150V at 80Hz elsewhere. To succeed in mass-marketing products, they'd need either a huge variety of power supplies and product "SKUs" to fit the variety of power services, or they'd need to invest research into a universal power supply that would work with them all. Either option is a waste of not only Sony's time and effort, but of every other company that would sell consumer electronics -- they'd each have to reinvent the wheel to create this universal power supply, and that's money that could have been spent on developing new types of products.

As a computer user, I want the most features I can get for the lowest cost. As an advanced user, I appreciate the flexibility to add or remove components and change defaults as I see fit, but that doesn't mean I don't want a complete, modern, functioning operating system out of the box. You'd be hard pressed today to find users who don't want access to the internet, email, and instant messaging when they turn on their new computer. To suggest that such functions are not part of the core operating system is to ignore the evidence of today's marketplace, in which not just Microsoft, but Apple and RedHat include these functions to satisfy customer demand. I support the proposed remedy allowing consumers to remove default functionality, but it is non-sensical to suggest that there is no benefit to having it there in the first place.

It is equally non-sensical to suggest that a "trimmed-down" operating system deserves a cheaper price than one with the complete complement of functionality. Today's software market clearly establishes that ISVs are willing to pay per-unit premiums to OEMs to include their applications on new computers. If AOL is willing to pay \$5 per machine to have its software installed, and Real Networks the same, then a "full-featured" computer with their software should cost \$10 less than the trimme-down version. A version of Windows lacking modern communications features would rightly cost more than the deluxe package.

In the interest of full disclosure, I will note that I am both a Microsoft employee and shareholder. My views, however, are my own, and do not necessarily reflect those of my employer and its officers.

-j

---

MSN Photos is the easiest way to share and print your photos: [Click Here](#)

MTC-00027565\_0002